arXiv:1109.5614v1 [math.AP] 26 Sep 2011

Orlicz–Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizer and multiplicity results for quasilinear elliptic equations[*]

Zhong Tan[†] Fei Fang[‡]

School of Mathematical Sciences, Xiamen University ,Xiamen, 361005,
P.R. China.

Abstract

We study the following boundary value problem

$$(P) \qquad \begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = f(x,u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

with nonhomogeneous principal part. By assuming the nonlinearity $f(x,t)$ being subcritical growth, some abstract results of problem (P) are obtained: (1) Regularity; (2) Orlicz–Sobolev versus Hölder local minimizer; (3) Strong comparison principle. Applying these abstract results and critical point theory, we prove the existence of multiple solutions of problem (P) in an Orlicz–Sobolev space.

Keywords. Orlicz–Sobolev spaces, Regularity, Strong comparison theorem, Multiplicity results, Critical groups.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. 35J70, 35J20, 35J65

1 Introduction

In this paper, the following boundary value problem is discussed

$$(P) \qquad \begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = f(x,u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \in R^N$ ia a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$, $a(t)t \in C(R)$ and $f(x,t) \in C(\Omega \times R)$. Especially, when $a(t) = |t|^{p-2}$, problem (P) is the well known p–Laplacian equation. There are a large number of papers on the existence of solutions for p-Laplacian equation. Readers can be refered to ([3, 7, 12, 13, 14, 21, 22, 27]) and the references therein for some results. Problem (P) is studied in an Orlicz-Sobolev space. The study of problem (P) in the Orlicz-Sobolev spaces has been received considerable attention in recent years. We refer to the overview papers [11, 16, 17, 19] for the advances and references of this area.

---

[*] Supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China - NSAF(Grant No. 10976026)

[†] E-mail address: tan85@xmu.edu.cn. Tel: +8613656009685

[‡] Corresponding author. E-mail address: fangfei68@163.com. Tel: +8613720896461

Problem (P) possesses more complicated nonlinearities, for example, it is inhomogeneous, so in the discussions, some special techniques will be needed. The inhomogeneous nonlinearities have important physical background, e.g.,

(1) nonlinear elasticity: $P(t) = (1 + t^2)^\gamma - 1, \gamma > \frac{1}{2}$,

(2) plasticity: $P(t) = t^\alpha(\log(1 + t))^\beta, \alpha \geq 1, \beta > 0$,

(3) generalized Newtonian fluids: $P(t) = \int_0^t s^{1-\alpha}(\sinh^{-1} s)^\beta ds, 0 \leq \alpha \leq 1, \beta > 0$.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2, we present some necessary preliminary knowledge.

In Section 3, a regularity results of problem (P) is proved, that is, any weak solution of problem (P) in Orlicz-Sobolev space belongs to $C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$. Applying the regularity results we extend Brezis and Nirenberg's results ([9]) to problem (P). In [9], Brezis and Nirenberg have proved a famous theorem which asserts that the local minimizers in the space C^1 are also local minimizers in the space H^1 for certain variational functionals. This theorem has been extended to the p–Laplacian case (see [7, 22]). In this section, we assert that local minimizers in the space C^1 are also local minimizers in the Orlicz–Sobolev space for the functional with respect to problem (P).

In Section 4, we give a general principle of sub-supersolution method for problem (P) based on the regularity results and the comparison principle, which is similar to the p–laplacian case. However, it is usually very difficult to find a subsolution u_0 and a supersolution v^0 of problem (P) with $u_0 \leq v^0$. The main difficulty is that problem (P) possesses more complicated nonlinearities than the p–Laplacian. So some techniques used in the p–laplacian case cannot be carried out for problem (P). We give a lemma involving the L^∞–estimation of the solution of problem (P) with $f = M$ (a positive constant), which is useful to find a supersolution of problem. In the end of this section, we give an application of our abstract theorems to the eigenvalue problems with respect to problem (P).

In Section 5, we give several applications of our abstract theorems to problem (P). Problem (P) is considered on a bounded domain, where the nonlinearity $f(x, t)$ is superlinear but dose not satisfy the usual Ambrosetti–Rabinowitz condition near infinity, or its dual version near zero. Nontrivial solutions are obtained by computing the critical groups and the sub-supersolution method.

2 Preliminaries

The function a is such that $p : R \to R$ defined by

$$p(t) = \begin{cases} a(|t|)t, & t \neq 0, \\ 0, & t = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

is an increasing homeomorphism from R onto itself and $f(x,t) \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times R, R)$.

Obviously, problem (P) allows a nonhomogeneous function p in the differential operator defining problem (P). To deal with this situation we introduce an Orlicz- Sobolev space setting for problem (P) as follows.

Let

$$P(t) := \int_0^t p(s)ds, \quad \widetilde{P}(t) := \int_0^t p^{-1}(s)ds, \quad t \in R, \tag{2.2}$$

then P and $\widetilde{P}$ are complementary N-functions(see [1, 33]), which define the Orlicz spaces $L^P := L^P(\Omega)$ and $L^{\widetilde{P}} := L^{\widetilde{P}}(\Omega)$, respectively.

Throughout this paper, we assume the following conditions on P:

(p_0): $a(t) \in C^1(0, +\infty)$, $a(t) > 0$ and $a(t)$ is a monotonic function for $t > 0$,

(p_1): $1 < p^- := \inf_{t>0} \frac{tp(t)}{P(t)} \leq p^+ := \sup_{t>0} \frac{tp(t)}{P(t)} < +\infty$,

(p_2): $0 < a^- := \inf_{t>0} \frac{tp'(t)}{p(t)} \leq a^+ := \sup_{t>0} \frac{tp'(t)}{p(t)} < +\infty$.

Under the conditions (p_0) and (p_1), the Orlicz space L^P coincides with the set (equivalence classes) of measurable functions $u : \Omega \to R$ such that

$$\int_\Omega P(|u|)dx < +\infty. \tag{2.3}$$

The space $L^P(\Omega)$ is a Banach space endowed with the Luxemburg norm

$$|u|_P := \inf\left\{k > 0, \int_\Omega P\left(\frac{|u|}{k}\right)dx < 1\right\}.$$

We shall denote by $W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ the corresponding Orlicz–Sobolev space with the norm

$$||u||_{W^{1,P}(\Omega)} := |u|_P + \left||\nabla u|\right|_P.$$

And denote by $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ the closure of C_0^∞ in $W^{1,P}(\Omega)$.

Let us now introduce the Orlicz–Sobolev conjugate P_* of P, which is given by

$$P_*^{-1}(t) := \int_0^t \frac{P^{-1}(\tau)}{\tau^{\frac{N+1}{N}}} d\tau \tag{2.4}$$

(see [1, 33]), where we suppose that

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\int_t^1 \frac{P^{-1}(\tau)}{\tau^{\frac{N+1}{N}}}d\tau < +\infty \text{ and } \lim_{t\to\infty}\int_1^t \frac{P^{-1}(\tau)}{\tau^{\frac{N+1}{N}}}d\tau = +\infty. \tag{2.5}$$

In the case $P(t) = \frac{|t|^p}{p}$, (2.5) holds if and only if $N > p$.

We will make the following assumptions on $f(x,t)$:

(f_*): There exists an odd increasing homeomorphism h from R to R, and nonnegative constants a_1, a_2 such that

$$|f(x,t)| \le a_1 + a_2 h(|t|), \forall t \in R, \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}.$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}\frac{H(t)}{P_*(kt)} = 0, \quad \forall k > 0,$$

where

$$H(t) := \int_0^t h(s)ds. \tag{2.6}$$

Let

$$\widetilde{H}(t) := \int_0^t h^{-1}(s)ds. \tag{2.7}$$

So we obtain complementary N-functions which define corresponding Orlicz spaces L^H and$L^{\widetilde{H}}$.

Set

$$p_*^- := \inf_{t>0}\frac{tP_*^{'}(t)}{P_*(t)}, \quad p_*^+ := \sup_{t>0}\frac{tP_*^{'}(t)}{P_*(t)}. \tag{2.8}$$

As in [11], by L'Hôpital's rule we have $p_*^- = \frac{Np^-}{N-p^-}$.

Similar to condition (p), we also assume the following condition on H:

(h): $1 < h^- := \inf_{t>0}\frac{th(t)}{H(t)} \le h^+ := \sup_{t>0}\frac{th(t)}{H(t)} < +\infty$.

Moreover, we assume that h^+ and h^- satisfy the following condition:

$$p^+ < h^- \le h^+ < p_*^-. \tag{2.9}$$

In this paper, the following equivalent norm on $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ will be used in below:

$$||u|| := \inf\left\{k > 0 : \int_\Omega P\left(\frac{|\nabla u|}{k}\right)dx < 1\right\}.$$

The reader is referred to [1, 33] for more details on Orlicz–Sobolev spaces theory. In the proofs of our results we shall use the following results.

Lemma 2.1 ([1]). *Under the condition (p), the spaces $L^P(\Omega)$, $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ and $W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ are separable and reflexive Banach spaces.*

Lemma 2.2 ([1]). *Under the condition (f_*), the imbedding*

$$W^{1,P}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^H(\Omega)$$

is compact.

Lemma 2.3. *Under the conditions (p_0),(p_1) and (p_2), we easily have*

(1) *If* $0 < t < 1$, *then* $P(1)t^{p^+} \le P(t) \le P(1)t^{p^-}$,

(2) *If* $t > 1$, *then* $P(1)t^{p^-} \le P(t) \le P(1)t^{p^+}$.

Lemma 2.4 ([16]). *Let* $\rho(u) = \int_\Omega P(u)dx$, *we have*

(1) *If* $|u|_P < 1$, *then* $|u|_P^{p^+} \le \rho(u) \le |u|_P^{p^-}$,

(2) *If* $|u|_P > 1$, *then* $|u|_P^{p^-} \le \rho(u) \le |u|_P^{p^+}$,

(3) *If* $0 < t < 1$, *then* $t^{p^+}P(u) \le P(tu) \le t^{p^-}P(u)$,

(4) *If* $t > 1$, *then* $t^{p^-}P(u) \le P(tu) \le t^{p^+}P(u)$.

Lemma 2.5 ([16]). *Let* $\widetilde{\rho}(u) = \int_\Omega \widetilde{P}(u)dx$, *we have*

(1) *If* $|u|_P < 1$, *then* $|u|_P^{p^-/(p^- -1)} \le \widetilde{\rho}(u) \le |u|_P^{p^+/(p^+-1)}$,

(2) *If* $|u|_P > 1$, *then* $|u|_P^{p^+/(p^+-1)} \le \widetilde{\rho}(u) \le |u|_P^{p^-/(p^- -1)}$,

(3) *If* $0 < t < 1$, *then* $t^{p^-/(p^- -1)}\widetilde{P}(u) \le \widetilde{P}(tu) \le t^{p^+/(p^+-1)}\widetilde{P}(u)$,

(4) *If* $t > 1$, *then* $t^{p^+/(p^+-1)}\widetilde{P}(u) \le \widetilde{P}(tu) \le t^{p^-/(p^- -1)}\widetilde{P}(u)$.

Lemma 2.6. *The condition (p_2) implies that*

$$a^- - 1 = \inf_{t>0} \frac{ta^{'}(t)}{a(t)} \le a^+ - 1 = \sup_{t>0} \frac{ta^{'}(t)}{a(t)} < +\infty.$$

Hence, similar to Lemma2.4, we easily have

(1) *If* $0 < t < 1$, *then* $t^{a^+-1}a(u) \le a(tu) \le t^{a^- -1}a(u)$,

(2) *If* $t > 1$, *then* $t^{a^- -1}a(u) \le a(tu) \le t^{a^+-1}a(u)$.

Lemma 2.7 ([1]). *Assume that $A(t)$ and $\widetilde{A}(t)$ are complementary N–functions. We have*

(1) *Young inequalities:* $uv \le A(u) + \widetilde{A}(v)$,

(2) *Hölder inequalities:* $|\int_\Omega u(x)v(x)dx| \le 2|u|_A|v|_{\widetilde{A}}$,

(3) $\widetilde{A}(\frac{A(u)}{u}) \le A(u)$,

(4) $\widetilde{A}_*(\frac{A_*(u)}{u}) \le A_*(u)$.

Remark2.1: Since problem (P) possesses inhomogeneous nonlinearities, Lemma2.3–2.7 are used to overcome the nonhomogeneous difficulty.

Definition 2.1. *$u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ is called a weak solution of problem (P) if*

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u\nabla\phi dx = \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi dx, \quad \forall\phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{2.10}$$

Set

$$\mathcal{P}(u) = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx, \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), \tag{2.11}$$

$$F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,s)ds, \quad \forall(x,t) \in \overline{\Omega} \times R, \tag{2.12}$$

$$I(u) = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x,u)dx, \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{2.13}$$

We know that the critical points of I are just the weak solutions of problem (P)(see [11]).

Write

$$\mathcal{F}(u) = \int_\Omega F(x,u)dx, \tag{2.14}$$

then $I(u) = \mathcal{P}(u) - \mathcal{F}(u)$.

Lemma 2.8. **(1)** *([17, 19]) The functional $\mathcal{P} \in C^1(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), R)$ is convex and sequentially weakly lower semi-continuous and*

$$\mathcal{P}'(u)\phi = \int_\Omega p(\nabla u)\nabla\phi dx, \quad \forall u,\phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega).$$

Moreover, the mapping $\mathcal{P}' : W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)^*$ is bounded homeomorphism, and is of type (S^+), namely,

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ and } \limsup_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{P}'(u_n)(u_n - u) \le 0 \text{ imply that } u_n \to u \text{ in } W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{2.15}$$

(2) *([11]) The functional $\mathcal{F}(u)$ is sequentially weakly continuous, $\mathcal{F}(u) \in C^1(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), R)$, and for all $u,\phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$,*

$$\mathcal{F}'(u)\phi = \int_\Omega f(x,u)\phi dx. \tag{2.16}$$

The mapping $\mathcal{F}' : W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)^*$ is weakly–strongly continuous, namely,

$$u_n \rightharpoonup u \text{ implies that } \mathcal{F}'(u_n) \to \mathcal{F}'(u), \tag{2.17}$$

where $\rightharpoonup$and $\to$denote the weak and strong convergence in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$, respectively.

3 Regularity and $W_0^{1,P}$versus C^1 local minimizers

In this section, we will firstly consider the regularity of weak solutions related to the following problem (3.1).

$$\operatorname{div}(A(x,\nabla u)) = B(x,u), \text{ in } \Omega, \tag{3.1}$$

where Ω is an open bounded subset of $R^N(N \geq 2)$, $A : \Omega \times R^N \to R^N$, $B : \Omega \times R \to R$. We assume that problem(3.1) satisfies the following growth conditions:

$$A(x,\eta)\eta \geq a_0 P(|\eta|) - c, \tag{3.2}$$

$$A(x,\eta) \leq a_1 p(|\eta|) + c, \tag{3.3}$$

$$B(x,u) \leq bh(|\eta|) + c, \tag{3.4}$$

where a_0, a_1, b, c are positive constant.

Definition 3.1. *$u \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ is said to be a weak solution of problem(3.1) if*

$$\int_\Omega A(x,Du)D\phi dx - \int_\Omega B(x,u)\phi dx = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

for $\forall \phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under the growth conditions (3.2-3.4), if $u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ is a weak solution of problem3.1, then $u \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\Omega)$. If in addition $u|_{\partial\Omega}$ is bounded, then $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$.*

Before the proof of the Theorem3.1, we give a lemma which play an important role in the proof of Theorem3.1.

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma2.4, [18])**.** *Let $u \in W^{1,p}(\Omega)(p > 1)$. If for any $B_\rho(x_0) \subset\subset \Omega$ with $\rho < R_0$ and any $\sigma \in (0,1)$ and any $k \geq k_0 > 0$*

$$\int_{A_{k,\rho-\sigma\rho}} |Du|^p dx \leq c\left[\int_{A_{k,\rho}} \left|\frac{u-k}{\sigma\rho}\right|^{p^*} dx + (k^r + 1)|A_{k,\rho}|\right], \tag{3.6}$$

where $A_{k,\rho} = \{x \in B_\rho(x_0) : u(x) > k\}$, $0 < r \leq p^*$, p^* is the Sobolev embedding exponent of p, c is a positive constant, then u is locally bounded above on Ω.

Proof of Theorem3.1. Let u be a weak solution of problem (3.1). Let $x_0 \in \Omega$. We will prove that u is locally bounded at x_0. Take a ball $B_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$.

For arbitrary balls $\overline{B}_t(x') \subset B_s(x') \subset B_{R_0}(x_0)$, let ξ be a C^∞ function such that

$$0 \leq \xi \leq 1, \ \operatorname{supp}\xi \subset B_s, \ \xi \equiv 1 \text{ on } B_t, \ |D\xi| \leq 2/(s-t). \tag{3.7}$$

For $k \geq 1$, set $\eta = \xi^{p^+}\max\{u-k, 0\}$. Then $\eta \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. By (3.1) we get

$$\int_{A_{k,s}} A(x,Du)Du\xi^{p^+} dx + p^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} A(x,Du)D\xi\xi^{p^+-1}(u-k)dx$$

$$-\int_{A_{k,s}} B(x,u)\xi^{p^+}(u-k)dx = 0, \tag{3.8}$$

where $A_{k,s} = \{x \in B_s : u(x) > k\}$.

For simplicity, we now write

$$J = \int_{A_{k,s}} P(|Du|)\xi^{p^+}dx, \quad Q = \int_{A_{k,s}} \left|\frac{u-k}{s-t}\right|^{p_*^-} dx. \tag{3.9}$$

From (3.2)-(3.4) and (3.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 J \leq\ & a_1 p^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} p(|Du|)|\xi|^{p^+-1}|D\xi|(u-k)dx \\ & + b\int_{A_{k,s}} h(|u|)|\xi|^{p^+}|(u-k)dx \\ & + cp^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} |\xi|^{p^+-1}||D\xi|(u-k)dx \\ & + c\int_{A_{k,s}} |\xi|^{p^+}(u-k)dx + c\int_{A_{k,s}} |\xi|^{p^+}dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Next let us estimate the terms of the right-hand side of (3.16). As $0 < s-t < 1$, we easily have

$$\int_{A_{k,s}} \xi^{p^+}dx \leq |A_{k,s}|, \tag{3.11}$$

$$\int_{A_{k,s}} \xi^{p^+}(u-k)dx \leq \int_{A_{k,s}} |u-k|dx \leq Q + |A_{k,s}|, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\int_{A_{k,s}} \xi^{p^+-1}|D\xi|(u-k)dx \leq 2\int_{A_{k,s}} \left|\frac{u-k}{s-t}\right| dx \leq 2Q + 2|A_{k,s}|. \tag{3.13}$$

By $0 < s-t < 1$, $p^+ < h^+ < p_*^-$ and Young inequalities , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{A_{k,s}} h(|u|)|\xi|^{p^+}(u-k)dx \\ \leq & \int h(|u|)(u-k)dx \\ = & \int_{A_{k,s}} \frac{h(|u|)|u|}{|u|}(u-k)dx \\ \leq & h^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} \frac{H(|u|)}{|u|}(u-k)dx \\ \leq & h^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} \widetilde{H}\Big(\frac{H(|u|)}{|u|}\Big)dx + \int_{A_{k,s}} H(|u-k|)dx \\ \leq & h^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} H(|u|)dx + \int_{A_{k,s}} H(|u-k|)dx \\ \leq & h^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} H(|u-k|+|k|)dx + \int_{A_{k,s}} H(|u-k|)dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq c_1 Q + c_2(k^{h^+} + 1)|A_{k,s}|. \tag{3.14}$$

Similarly, using Young inequalities and taking $\varepsilon_1 \in (0,1)$ such that,

$$a_1 (p^+)^2 \varepsilon_1^{\frac{p^+}{p^+-1}} = \frac{a_0}{4}, \tag{3.15}$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& a_1 p^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} p(|Du|)|\xi|^{p^+-1}|D\xi|(u-k)dx \\
& = a_1 p^+ \int_{A_{k,s}} \frac{p(|Du|)|Du||\xi|^{p^+-1}}{|Du|}|D\xi|(u-k)dx \\
& \leq a_1 (p^+)^2 \int_{A_{k,s}} \frac{P(|Du|)|\xi|^{p^+-1}}{|Du|}|D\xi|(u-k)dx \\
& \leq a_1 (p^+)^2 \left[\int_{A_{k,s}} \widetilde{P}\left(\varepsilon_1 \frac{P(|Du|)|\xi|^{p^+-1}}{|Du|}\right)dx + \int_{A_{k,s}} P\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_1}|D\xi|(u-k)\right)dx \right] \\
& \leq a_1 (p^+)^2 \left[\varepsilon_1^{\frac{p^+}{p^+-1}} \int_{A_{k,s}} |\xi|^{p^+} \widetilde{P}\left(\frac{P(|Du|)}{|Du|}\right)dx + (\varepsilon_1)^{-p^+} \int_{A_{k,s}} P\left(|D\xi|(u-k)\right)dx \right] \\
& \leq a_1 (p^+)^2 \left[\varepsilon_1^{\frac{p^+}{p^+-1}} \int_{A_{k,s}} |\xi|^{p^+} P(|Du|)dx + (\varepsilon_1)^{-p^+} 2^{p^+} \int_{A_{k,s}} P\left(\left|\frac{u-k}{s-t}\right|\right)dx \right] \\
& \leq \frac{a_0}{4} J + c_3 Q + c_4 |A_{k,s}|.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

From (3.11)–(3.16), we obtain

$$J \leq c_5 (Q + (k^{h^+} + 1)|A_{k,s}|), \tag{3.17}$$

and therefore

$$\int_{A_{k,t}} |Du|^{p^-} dx \leq c_6 \left[\int_{A_{k,s}} \left|\frac{u-k}{s-t}\right|^{p_*^-} dx + (k^{h^+} + 1)|A_{k,s}| \right]. \tag{3.18}$$

By Lemma3.1, (3.18) implies that u is bounded above on $B_{R_0}(x_0)$ and hence u is locally bounded above on Ω.

Similarly we can prove that $-u$ is also locally bounded above on Ω. So $u \in L^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega)$. If in addition $\max_{\partial\Omega} |u(x)| = M < +\infty$, then for every $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, by the similar argument as above we can prove that (3.18) holds for $k \geq M$ and therefore $u \in L^\infty(\Omega)$. Theorem3.1 is proved. □

In [29, 30], Lieberman has considered the regularity of weak solutions to the following boundary value problems

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(A(x,u,\nabla u)) + B(x,u,\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = \phi, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.19}$$

Applying his results and Theorem3.1 to problem (P), we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Let $f(x,t)$ satisfy the condition (f_*) and u be a weak solution in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ of problem (P). Then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$.*

Remark3.1: Corollary3.1 improves a recent result of Fukagai and Narukawa [17, Lemma4.1], where the conclusion of corollary3.1 was obtained under the following assumptions:

(i) $f(x,0) = 0$, $f(x,t) \geq 0$ for $x \in \Omega$, $t > 0$, and there exists an open set $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ such that $f(x,t) > 0$ for $x \in \Omega_0$, $t > 0$.

(ii) $f(x,t)t \leq cP(t)$ for $x \in \Omega, t \geq 0$ with some constant $c > 0$.

In Corollary3.1, we only assume that $f(x,t)$ satisfies the condition (f_*), so Corollary3.1 is natural extension of p–Laplacian case.

Lemma 3.2. *There exist constants d_l, d_2, depending on a^-, a^+, such that*

$$|a(|\eta|)\eta - a(|\xi|)\xi| \leq d_1|\eta - \xi|a(|\eta| + |\xi|). \tag{3.20}$$

If $a(t)$ is decreasing for $t > 0$, we get

$$|a(|\eta|)\eta - a(|\xi|)\xi| \leq d_2 p(|\eta - \xi|), \tag{3.21}$$

for all $\eta, \xi \in R^N$.

Proof. Since (3.20) is symmetric in η, ξ, we can assume that $|\xi| \geq |\eta|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |a(|\eta|)\eta - a(|\xi|)\xi| &= \left| \int_0^1 \frac{d}{dt}\{a(|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|)(\xi + t(\eta - \xi))\}dt \right| \\ &= \left| \int_0^1 a'(|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|)\frac{(\xi + t(\eta - \xi)) \cdot (\eta - \xi)}{|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|}(\xi + t(\eta - \xi))dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_0^1 a(|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|)(\eta - \xi)dt \right| \\ &\leq c|\eta - \xi| \int_0^1 a(|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|)dt. \end{aligned} \tag{3.22}$$

Since $|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)| = |(1-t)\xi + t\eta| \leq |\eta| + |\xi|, \forall t \in (0,1)$, if $a(t)$ is increasing, we obtain

$$|a(|\eta|)\eta - a(|\xi|)\xi| \leq d_1|\eta - \xi|a(|\eta + \xi|). \tag{3.23}$$

To get the (3.20) for $a(t)$ being decreasing, we have to prove that

$$\int_0^1 a(|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)|)dt \leq ca(|\eta| + |\xi|). \tag{3.24}$$

Note that if $|\eta - \xi| \leq \frac{|\xi|}{2}$, then

$$|\xi + t(\eta - \xi)| \geq |\xi| - |\xi - \eta| \geq \frac{|\xi|}{2} \geq \frac{|\eta| + |\xi|}{4}, \tag{3.25}$$

so that (3.24) hold with $c = \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{a^- -1}$.

If $|\eta - \xi| > \frac{|\xi|}{2} > 0$,we set $t_0 = \frac{|\xi|}{|\eta - \xi|} \in (0, 2)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |\xi + t(\eta - \xi)| &\geq ||\xi| - t|\eta - \xi|| = |t - t_0||\eta - \xi| \\ &\geq |t - t_0|\frac{|\xi|}{2} \geq |t - t_0|\frac{|\eta| + |\xi|}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

For any $t_0 \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\int_0^1 a\left(\frac{|t_0 - t|}{4}(|\eta| + |\xi|)\right) dt \leq ca(|\eta| + |\xi|). \tag{3.27}$$

So that (3.27) holds with $c = \left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{a^- -1}\left(\frac{t_0^{a^-}}{a^-} + \frac{(1-t_0)^{a^-}}{a^-}\right)$.

Finally, $|\eta - \xi| \leq |\eta| + |\xi|$ implies (3.21). □

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that $f(x, t)$ satisfies the condition (f_*). If $u \in C_0^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is a local minimizer of I in the C^1 topology, then u_0 is a local minimizer of I in the $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ topology.*

***Proof*.** Let $u_0 \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ is a local minimizer of I in the C^1 topology. Define

$$G(u) = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u - \nabla u_0|)dx, \ \forall u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{3.28}$$

For $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, set $D_\varepsilon = \{u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) : G(u) \leq \varepsilon\}$. Then D_ε is bounded, closed and convex subset of $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ and is a neighborhood of u_0 in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. Since $f(x, t)$ satisfies the subcritical growth condition, the functional $I : W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \to R$ is weakly lower semi-continuous and consequently $\inf_{D_\varepsilon} I$ is achieved at some $u_\varepsilon \in D_\varepsilon$. So there is $\mu_\varepsilon \leq 0$ such that $I' = \mu_\varepsilon G'(u_\varepsilon)$, that is

$$-\operatorname{div}\left\{a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon\right\} + \mu_\varepsilon \operatorname{div}\left\{a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla u_0|)(\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla u_0)\right\} = f(x, u_\varepsilon). \tag{3.29}$$

Arguing by contradiction, assume that u_0 is not a local minimizer of I in the $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ topology, then for each $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$, $u_\varepsilon \neq u_0$ and $I(u_\varepsilon) < I(u_0)$. Note that $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Below we shall prove that $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, which contradicts with that u_0 is a local minimizer of I in the C^1 topology.

Dividing both sides of (3.29) by $1 - \mu_\varepsilon$, yields

$$\begin{aligned} &-\operatorname{div}\left\{\frac{1}{1 - \mu_\varepsilon}\left[a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon) - \mu_\varepsilon a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla u_0|)(\nabla u_\varepsilon - \nabla u_0)\right]\right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{1 - \mu_\varepsilon} f(x, u_\varepsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{3.30}$$

Define $A_\varepsilon : \overline{\Omega} \times R^N \to R^N$ and $B_\varepsilon : \overline{\Omega} \times R \to R$ by

$$A_\varepsilon(x, \eta) = \frac{1}{1 - \mu_\varepsilon}\left[a(|\eta|)\eta) - \mu_\varepsilon a(|\eta - \nabla u_0|)(\alpha - \nabla u_0)\right],$$

$$B_\varepsilon(x,t) = \frac{1}{1-\mu_\varepsilon} f(x,t). \tag{3.31}$$

Then u_ε is a solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(A_\varepsilon(x,\nabla u)) = B_\varepsilon(x,u), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{3.32}$$

We can verify that A_ε and B_ε satisfy the following conditions:

$$A_\varepsilon(x,\eta)\eta \geq a_0 P(|\eta|) - c, \tag{3.33}$$

$$A_\varepsilon(x,\eta) \leq a_1 p(|\eta|) + c, \tag{3.34}$$

$$B_\varepsilon(x,u) \leq bh(|z|) + c, \tag{3.35}$$

where a_0, a_1, b, c are positive constants independent of $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$.

The verification of (3.34) and (3.35) are simple, here we only give the proof of (3.33). By definition of $A_\varepsilon(x,\eta)$

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon(x,\eta)\eta &= \frac{1}{1-\mu_\varepsilon}\Big[(a(|\eta|)\eta - \mu_\varepsilon a(|\eta|)\eta) - \mu_\varepsilon(a(|\eta - \nabla u_0|)(\eta - \nabla u_0) - a(|\eta|)\eta)\Big]\eta \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\mu_\varepsilon}\Big[(1-\mu_\varepsilon)P(|\eta|) - \mu_\varepsilon J\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

where

$$J = [a(|\eta - \nabla u_0|)(\eta - \nabla u_0) - a(|\eta|)\eta]\eta. \tag{3.37}$$

By lemma3.2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} |J| &= \Big|a(|\eta - \nabla u_0|)(\eta - \nabla u_0) - a(|\eta|)\eta\Big||\eta| \\ &\leq c|\nabla u_0| a(|\eta - \nabla u_0| + |\eta|)|\eta| \\ &\leq cp(|\eta|) + c \leq \frac{1}{2}P(|\eta|) + c, \end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

and when $a(t)$ is decreasing,

$$\begin{aligned} |J| &= |a(|\eta - \nabla u_0|)(\eta - \nabla u_0) - a(|\eta|)\eta| \\ &\leq ca(|\nabla u_0|)|\nabla u_0||\eta| \leq \frac{1}{2}P(|\eta|) + c, \end{aligned} \tag{3.39}$$

where c is a generic positive constant independent of ε.

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_\varepsilon(x,\eta)\eta &\geq \frac{1}{1-\mu_\varepsilon}\Big[(1-\mu_\varepsilon)P(|\eta|) - \mu_\varepsilon J\Big] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{1-\mu_\varepsilon}\Big[(1-\mu_\varepsilon)P(|\eta|) - \mu_\varepsilon(\frac{1}{2}P(|\eta|) + c)\Big] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\geq \frac{1}{1+\mu_\varepsilon}\Big[(1+\frac{1}{2}\mu_\varepsilon)P(|\eta|)-c\mu_\varepsilon)\Big]\\&\geq \frac{1}{2}P(|\eta|)-c,\end{aligned}\tag{3.40}$$

and (3.33) is proved. It follows from Theorem3.1 that $u_\varepsilon \in L^\infty$ and $|u_\varepsilon|_{L^\infty}$ is bounded uniformly for $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, where c is a positive constant independent of ε.

Below we shall prove that $\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar\Omega)} \leq c$ for some $\alpha \in (0,1)$ by using the results in [29, 30] in the following two cases, respectively.

Case(i): $\mu_\varepsilon \in [-1,0]$.

Note that u_0 satisfies the equation

$$-\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0) = f(x,u_0).\tag{3.41}$$

The formula (3.29) is equivalent to the following:

$$\begin{aligned}&-\operatorname{div}\Big\{a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon|)\nabla u_\varepsilon)-\mu_\varepsilon a(|\nabla u_\varepsilon-\nabla u_0|)(\nabla u_\varepsilon-\nabla u_0)-\mu_\varepsilon a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0)\Big\}\\&= f(x,u_\varepsilon)-\mu_\varepsilon f(x,u_0).\end{aligned}\tag{3.42}$$

Define $\bar A_\varepsilon : \bar\Omega\times R^N \to R^N$ and $\bar B_\varepsilon : \bar\Omega\times R\to R$ by

$$\begin{aligned}&\bar A_\varepsilon(x,\eta) = a(|\eta|)\eta-\mu_\varepsilon a(|\eta-\nabla u_0|)(\eta-\nabla u_0)-\mu_\varepsilon a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0),\\&\bar B_\varepsilon(x,t) = f(x,t)-\mu_\varepsilon f(x,u_0).\end{aligned}\tag{3.43}$$

Then u_ε is a solution of the following problem:

$$\begin{cases}-\operatorname{div}(\bar A_\varepsilon(x,\nabla u)) = \bar B_\varepsilon(x,u), & \text{in } \Omega,\\ u=0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega.\end{cases}\tag{3.44}$$

We need to show that, for $x,y\in\bar\Omega, \eta\in R^N\backslash\{0\}, \xi\in R^N, t\in R$, the following estimations hold:

$$\bar A_\varepsilon(x,0)=0,\tag{3.45}$$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N \frac{\partial(\bar A_\varepsilon)_j}{\partial\eta_i}(x,\eta)\xi_i\xi_j \geq \frac{p(|\eta|)}{|\eta|}|\xi|^2,\tag{3.46}$$

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^N \left|\frac{\partial(\bar A_\varepsilon)_j}{\partial\eta_i}(x,\eta)\right||\eta| \leq c(1+p(|\eta|)),\tag{3.47}$$

$$|\bar A_\varepsilon(x,\eta)-\bar A_\varepsilon(y,\eta)| \leq c(1+p(|\eta|))(|x-y|^\theta),\ \text{ for some } \theta\in(0,1),\tag{3.48}$$

$$|\bar B_\varepsilon(x,t)| \leq c+ch(|t|).\tag{3.49}$$

Inequalities (3.46) and (3.47) follow from Lemma3.2 and the following derivative

$$\begin{aligned} D_\eta(a(|\eta|)\eta) &= a'(|\eta|)\frac{\eta\otimes\eta}{|\eta|} + a(|\eta|)id \\ &= a(|\eta|)\Big(id + \frac{a'(|\eta|)|\eta|}{a(|\eta|)}\frac{\eta\otimes\eta}{|\eta|^2}\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{3.50}$$

Inequality (3.48) follows from lemma3.2 and the fact that $\nabla u_0(x)$ is Hölder continuous.

By the regularity results in [29, 30], under the conditions (3.45)–(3.49), $u_\varepsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq c$, where the positive constant c is independent of $\mu_\varepsilon \in [-1, 0]$. From this and $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ it follows that $u_\varepsilon \to u_0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$.

Case(ii): $\mu_\varepsilon < -1$.

Set $v_\varepsilon = u_\varepsilon - u_0$. Then from (3.29) we know that v_ε satisfies the equation

$$\begin{aligned} &-\operatorname{div}\Big[a(|\nabla v_\varepsilon|)\nabla v_\varepsilon) + \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}(a(|\nabla v_\varepsilon + \nabla u_0|)(\nabla v_\varepsilon + \nabla u_0) - \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0\Big] \\ &= \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}\Big[f(x, v_\varepsilon + u_0) - f(x, u_0)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.51}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{A}_\varepsilon(x,\eta) &= a(|\eta|)\eta) + \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}(a(|\eta + \nabla u_0|)(\eta + \nabla u_0) - \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0, \\ \widetilde{B}_\varepsilon(x,t) &= \frac{1}{|\mu_\varepsilon|}\Big[f(x, t + u_0) - f(x, u_0)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Analogously to the case (i), we can prove that $\widetilde{A}_\varepsilon$ and $\widetilde{B}_\varepsilon$ satisfy the corresponding conditions (3.45)–(3.49). So by regularity results in [29, 30], $v_\varepsilon \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ and $\|u_\varepsilon\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})} \leq c$, furthermore $v_\varepsilon \to 0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, that is $v_\varepsilon \to v_0$ in $C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. The proof of Theorem3.2 is complete. □

4 Sub-supersolution method and multiplicity results

In this section, firstly, A general principle of sub–supersolution for problem (P) is given based on the regularity results and the comparison principle. Secondly, in order to utilize the results of Section 1-3, an abstract result which provides a method to find a positive minimizer of functional I in the C^1–topology is proved. At last, by several assumptions on $f(x,t)$, we give an application of the principle of sub–supersolution and the abstract result.

Definition 4.1. *Let $u, v \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$. We say that $-\Delta_P u \leq -\Delta_P v$ if for all $\phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ with $\phi \geq 0$,*

$$\int_\Omega a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u \nabla\phi dx \leq \int_\Omega a(|\nabla v|)\nabla v \nabla\phi dx, \tag{4.1}$$

where $-\Delta_P u = -\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u)$.

Lemma 4.1 (Comparison principle)**. (1)** *Let* $u, v \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$. *If* $-\Delta_P u \leq -\Delta_P v$ *and* $u \leq v$ *on* $\partial\Omega$*(i.e.,* $(u-v)^+ \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$*), then* $u \leq v$ *in* Ω.

(2) *Under the conditions of (1) above, let in addition* $u, v \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ *and denote* $S = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) = v(x)\}$. *If* S *is a compact subset of* Ω, *then* $S = \emptyset$.

Proof. (1) Taking $\phi = (u-v)^+$ as a test function in (4.1), we can obtain $\nabla(u-v)^+ = 0$, this implies $(u-v)^+ = 0$ and so $u \leq v$ in Ω.

(2) Assume that S is a compact subset of Ω and $S \neq \emptyset$. Then there is an open subset Ω_1 of Ω such that $S \subset \Omega_1 \subset \overline{\Omega_1} \subset \Omega$. Thus $u < v$ on $\partial\Omega_1$ and consequently there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $u < v - \varepsilon$ on $\partial\Omega_1$. Noting that $\nabla(v-\varepsilon) = \nabla v$ and applying the conclusion (1) to and $v - \varepsilon$ on Ω_1 we obtain $u \leq v - \varepsilon$ in Ω_1, which contradicts with $u = v$ on S. □

It is well known that, when $p \neq 2$, the strong comparison principles for the p–Laplacian equations are very complicated (see [12, 13, 32]). Here we give a strong comparison principle for problem (P), which is suitable to find a positive C^1 local minimizer of the energy functional I in the C^1 topology. The proof is similar to the p–Laplacian case (see [20]).

Lemma 4.2. *Let* $h_1, h_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega), 0 \leq h_1(x) \leq h_2(x)$ *and* $u, v \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. *If*

$$-\Delta_P u = h_1 \leq -\Delta_P v = h_2, \tag{4.2}$$

and the set

$$C = \{x \in \Omega : h_1(x) = h_2(x)\} \tag{4.3}$$

has an empty interior, then

$$\begin{cases} 0 \leq u < v, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ 0 \leq \frac{\partial u}{\partial n} < \frac{\partial v}{\partial n}, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

and there exists a positive constant ε *such that*

$$\frac{\partial(v-u)}{\partial n} \geq \varepsilon, \tag{4.5}$$

where n denotes the inward unit normal on $\partial\Omega$.

Similar to p–laplacian case, for given $h \in L^{\widetilde{H}}(\Omega)$, the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = h(x), & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

has a unique solution $u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. We denote by $K(h) := u$ the unique solution. K is called the solution operator for (4.6). We have the following basic principle of sub–supersolution method for problem (P).

Lemma 4.3. *Assume that $f(x,t)$ satisfies (f_*) and $f(x,t)$ is nondecreasing in $t \in R$. If there exist a subsolution $u_0 \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ and a supersolution $v^0 \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ of problem (P) such that $u_0 \le v^0$, then problem (P) has a minimal solution u_* and a maximal solution v^* in the order interval $[u_0, v^0]$, i.e., $u_0 \le u_* \le v^* \le v^0$ and if u is any solution of problem (P) such that $u_0 \le u \le v^0$, then $\le u_* \le v^*$.*

Proof. Define $T(u) = K(f(x,u))$. Under the assumptions of Lemma4.3, since the imbedding $W^{1,P}(\Omega) \hookrightarrow L^H(\Omega)$ is compact,we have $T : L^H(\Omega) \to L^H(\Omega)$ is completely continuous and increasing, $u_0 \le v^0$, $u_0, v^0 \in L^H(\Omega), u_0 \le T(u_0), v^0 \ge T(v^0)$, and consequently $T : [u_0, v^0] \to [u_0, v^0]$. It is clear that the cone of all nonnegative functions in $L^H(\Omega)$ is normal. So our Theorem4.1 now follows by applying the well-known fixed point theorem for the increasing operator on the order interval (see [4]). □

In the practical problems it is often known that the subsolution u_0 and the supersolution v^0 are of class $L^\infty(\Omega)$, so the restriction on the growth condition of f is needless, hence the following lemma is more suitable.

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $u_0, v^0 \in W^{1,P}(\Omega) \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$, $u_0, v^0 \in W^{1,P}(\Omega)$ are a subsolution and a supersolution of problem (P) respectively , and $u_0 \le v^0$. If $f(x,t) \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times R, R)$ satisfies the condition:*

$$f(x,t) \text{ is nondecreasing in } t \in [\inf u_0(x), \sup v^0(x)], \tag{4.7}$$

then the concusion of lemma4.3 is valid.

The proof Lemma4.4 is similar to the proof of lemma4.3 and is omitted here. **Remark4.1:** In Lemma4.4, as was done in the p–laplacian case (see,[4, 9, 15, 20]), the condition (4.7) can be replaced by some weaker conditions, for example, by the following condition:

there exists a positive constant c such that

$$f(x,t) + ct \text{ is nondecreasing in } t \in [\inf u_0(x), \sup v^0(x)]. \tag{4.8}$$

The following theorem provides a method to find a positive C^1 local minimizer of the integral functional I in the C^1 topology.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume that $u_0, v^0 \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ are a subsolution and a supersolution of problem (P) respectively, $-\Delta_P u_0 = h_1(x)$, $-\Delta_P v^0 = h_2(x)$, $h_1, h_2 \in L^\infty(\Omega)$, $0 \le h_1 \le h_2$, $h_1(x) \not\equiv h_2(x)$ and $0 \le u_0 \le v^0$ in Ω . Assume that $f(x,t) \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times R)$ satisfies the condition (4.7) or (4.8). If neither u_0 nor v^0 is a solution of problem (P), or neither u_0 nor v^0 is a minimizer of I on $[u_0, v^0] \cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ in the case of being a solution of problem (P), then there exists $u_* \in [u_0, v^0] \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $I(u_*) = \inf\{I(u) : u \in [u_0, v^0] \cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\}$, u_* is a solution of problem (P) and u_* is a local minimizer of I in the C^1 topology.*

***Proof*.** Under the assumptions of theorem, by Corollary3.1, $u_0, v^0 \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Define $\widetilde{f} : \overline{\Omega} \times R \to R$ by

$$\widetilde{f}(x,t) = \begin{cases} f(x, u_0(x)), & \text{if } t < u_0(x), \\ f(x,s), & \text{if } u_0(x) \le t \le v^0(x), \\ f(x, v^0(x)), & \text{if } t > v^0(x). \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

Set $\widetilde{F}(x,t) = \int_0^t \widetilde{f}(x,s)ds$ and

$$I(u) = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - \int_\Omega \widetilde{F}(x,u)dx, \quad \forall u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{4.10}$$

It is easy to see that the minimum of $\widetilde{I}$ on $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ is achieved at some $u_* \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. Then u_* satisfies the equation

$$-\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u_*|)\nabla u_*) = \widetilde{f}(x,u_*), \tag{4.11}$$

and consequently $u_* \in C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$.

Since

$$-\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u_0|)\nabla u_0) \le f(x,u_0) = \widetilde{f}(x,u_0) \le \widetilde{f}(x,u_*) = -\operatorname{div}(a(|\nabla u_*|)\nabla u_*), \tag{4.12}$$

using Lemma4.1(1), $u_0 \le u_*$. Repeating the same reasoning, we can obtain $u_* \le v^0$. Note that for all $u \in [u_0, v^0] \cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$, $\widetilde{f}(x,u) = f(x,u)$, $\widetilde{F}(x,u) - F(x,u)$ is a function of x, and $\widetilde{I}(x,u) - I(x,u)$ is a constant. Hence u_* is a solution of problem (P) and is a minimizer of I on $u \in [u_0, v^0] \cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. It follows from Lemma4.2 that

$$\begin{cases} 0 \le u_0 < u_* < v_0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ 0 \le \frac{\partial u_0}{\partial n} < \frac{\partial u_*}{\partial n} < \frac{\partial v^0}{\partial n}, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.13}$$

and there exists a positive constant ε such that

$$\frac{\partial(u^* - u_0)}{\partial n}, \frac{\partial(v^0 - u_*)}{\partial n} \ge \varepsilon. \tag{4.14}$$

Thus there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \cap B_{C^1}(u_*, \delta) := \{u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega}) : \|u - u_*\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega})} < \delta\} \subset [u_0, v^0]. \tag{4.15}$$

Noting that $I(u) = \widetilde{I}(u) + c$ for $u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \cap B_{C^1}(u_*, \delta)$, we see that u_* is a local minimizer of I in the C^1 topology. The proof is complete. □

As an application of the above abstract theorems, let us consider the following eigenvalue problem:

$$(P_\lambda)\quad \begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = \lambda f(x,u) + \mu |u|^{q-1}u, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u > 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.16}$$

where Ω is a bounded smooth domain in R^N, $q > p^+$, $f \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times R, R)$, $f(x,t) \geq 0$ and $t \geq 0$, $f(x,t)$ is nondecreasing in $t \geq 0$, $\mu \geq 0$ is fixed. The energy functional associated with problem (P_λ) is

$$I_\lambda = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x,u)dx - \frac{\mu}{q}\int_\Omega |u|^q dx,\ \forall u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), \tag{4.17}$$

where $F(x,t) = \int_0^t f(x,s)ds$. The corresponding problems in p–laplacian case have been by many authors (see[3, 6, 9, 22, 26])

Theorem 4.2. *Assume that f satisfies the condition either*

(i) $f(x,0) \not\equiv 0$ *in* Ω, *or*

(ii) $f(x,0) \equiv 0$ *and there are an open set* $U \subset \Omega$, *a closed ball* $\overline{B}(x_0,\varepsilon) \subset U$, *the positive constant* $r_0 > 1$ *and* c, *such that* $f(x,t) \geq ct^{r_0-1}$ *for* $x \in \overline{B}(x_0,\varepsilon)$ *and* $t \in [0,1]$, *and* $r_0 < p^-$ *for* $x \in \partial U$.

Then we have the following assertions:

(1) *For sufficiently small* $\lambda > 0$, *Problem* (P_λ) *has a solution* u_λ *which is a local minimizer of* I_λ *in the* C^1 *topology. Moreover,* $\|u_\lambda\|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega})} \to 0$ *as* $\lambda \to 0$.

(2) *Define* $\Lambda_0 = \{\lambda > 0 : (P_\lambda)$ *has a solution* u_λ *which is a local minimizer of* I_λ *in the* C^1 *topology*$\}$ *and* $\Lambda = \{\lambda > 0 : (P_\lambda)$ *has a solution* u_λ $\}$. *Then* Λ_0 *and* Λ *are both intervals,* $\inf \Lambda_0 = \inf \Lambda = 0$ *and* $\mathrm{int}\Lambda \subset \Lambda_0$.

(3) *In addition, assume that* $\mu > 0$, $q < p_*^-$ *and*

$$|f(x,t)| \leq c(1 + r(|t|))\ for\ \in x \in \Omega \text{ and } t \in R,$$

where $r^+ < p_*^-$ *and* $r^+ < q_-$. *Then for each* $\lambda \in \mathrm{int}\Lambda$, (P_λ) *has at least two solutions* u_λ *and* v_λ *such that* $u_\lambda < v_\lambda$ *and* u_λ *is a local minimizer of* I_λ *in the* $W_0^{1,P}$ *topology.*

Before the proof Theorem4.2, we give a lemma which is useful to find a supersolution of problem (P_λ).

Lemma 4.5. *Let* $M > 0$ *and* u *is the unique solution of problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = M, & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{4.18}$$

Set $m = \frac{1}{2|\Omega|^{1/N}C_0}$. *Then, when* $M \geq m$, $|u|_\infty \leq C^* M^{\frac{1}{p^- - 1}}$, *and when* $M < m$, $|u|_\infty \leq C_* M^{\frac{1}{p^+ - 1}}$, *where* C^* *and* C_* *are positive constants depending on* $p^+, p^-, N, |\Omega|$ *and* C_0.

Proof. Let u be the solution of (4.18), then $u \geq 0$. For $k \geq 0$, set $A_k = \{x \in \Omega : u(x) > k\}$. Taking $(u - k)^+$ as a test function of (4.18), using Young inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx &= M \int_{A_k} (u - k)dx \\
&\leq M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} |(u - k)^+|_{L^{N/(N-1)}(\Omega)} \leq M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \int_{A_k} \varepsilon |\nabla u| \varepsilon^{-1} dx \\
&\leq M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \int_{A_k} \Big(P(\varepsilon|\nabla u|) + \widetilde{P}(\varepsilon^{-1})\Big)dx \\
&\leq M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \varepsilon^{p^-} \int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx + M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \int_{A_k} \widetilde{P}(\varepsilon^{-1})dx, \qquad (4.19)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to the continuous embedding $W_0^{1,1} \subset L^{\frac{N}{N-1}}(\Omega)$ and C_0 is the best constant of the embedding.

When $M \geq m$, taking

$$\varepsilon = \left(\frac{1}{2M|\Omega|^{1/N}C_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^-}} = \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^-}}, \qquad (4.20)$$

then $\varepsilon < 1$ and

$$M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \varepsilon^{p^-} \int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx \leq \frac{1}{2} \int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx. \qquad (4.21)$$

Consequently, from this and (4.19), we get

$$\int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx \leq 2M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}} C_0 \int_{A_k} \widetilde{P}(\varepsilon^{-1})dx \leq 2M|A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}+1} C_0 \widetilde{P}(\varepsilon^{-1}). \qquad (4.22)$$

So we have

$$\int_{A_k} (u - k)dx = \frac{1}{M} \int_{A_k} P(|\nabla u|)dx \leq \gamma |A_k|^{\frac{1}{N}+1}, \qquad (4.23)$$

where

$$\gamma = 2C_0 \widetilde{P}(\varepsilon^{-1}). \qquad (4.24)$$

Using Lemma5.1 in[25, Chapter 2], (4.23) implies that

$$|u|_\infty \leq \gamma (N + 1)|\Omega|^{\frac{1}{N}}. \qquad (4.25)$$

From (4.20), (4.24) and (4.25) we obtain

$$|u|_\infty \leq C^* M^{\frac{1}{p^- - 1}}, \qquad (4.26)$$

where

$$C^* = \widetilde{P}(1)(N + 1)(2C_0)^{\frac{p^-}{p^- - 1}} |\Omega|^{\frac{p^-}{N(p^- - 1)}}. \qquad (4.27)$$

When $M < m$, taking

$$\varepsilon = \left(\frac{1}{2M|\Omega|^{1/N}C_0}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^+}} = \left(\frac{m}{M}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^+}}, \tag{4.28}$$

(noting that in this case $\varepsilon > 1$) and using arguments similar to those above we can obtain

$$|u|_\infty \le C_* M^{\frac{1}{p^+-1}}, \tag{4.29}$$

where

$$C_* = \widetilde{P}(1)(N+1)(2C_0)^{\frac{p^+}{p^+-1}}|\Omega|^{\frac{p^-}{N(p^+-1)}}. \tag{4.30}$$

The proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem4.2. (1) Take $0 < M < m$, where m is as in Lemma4.5, and let $v = v_M$ be the unique positive solution of (4.18). Then by Lemma4.5, $|v|_\infty \le C_* M^{1/(p^+-1)}$. Since $q > p^+$, we can choose M small enough such that $\mu(C_* M^{1/(p^+-1)})^{q-1} < \frac{M}{2}$, which implies that $\mu v^{q-1} < \frac{M}{2}$. Let $\lambda > 0$ be sufficiently samll such that $\lambda f(x, v) < \frac{M}{2}$. Then for such λ,

$$-\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla v|)\nabla v) = M > \lambda f(x, v) + \mu |v|^{q-2} v,$$

which shows that v is a supersolution of (P_λ) and is not a solution of (P_λ). By Lemma4.2, $v > 0$ in Ω and $\frac{\partial v}{\partial n} > 0$ on $\partial\Omega$.

In the case when f satisfies the condition (i), $\mathbf{0}$ is a subsolution of (P_λ) and $\mathbf{0}$ does not satisfy the equation in (P_λ). Moreover, by Theorem4.1, (P_λ) has a solution $u_\lambda \in [0, v] \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})$, which is a local minimizer of I_λ in the C^1 topology.

In the case when f satisfies the condition (ii), $\mathbf{0}$ satisfies the equation in (P_λ). We claim that $\mathbf{0}$ is not a minimizer of I_λ on $[0, v] \cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. To see this, noting $I_\lambda(0) = 0$, it is sufficient to show that $\inf_{[0,v]\cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)} I_\lambda(u) < 0$. For $\delta > 0$ denote $U_\delta = \{x \in U : \mathrm{dist}(x, \partial U) < \delta\}$. By the condition (ii), we can find sufficiently small positive constants δ such that $\overline{B}(x_0, \varepsilon) \subset U \setminus U_\delta$ and $r_0 < p^-$. Define a function $w \in C_0^\infty(U)$ such that $0 \le w \le 1$ and $w = 1$ on $U \backslash U_\delta$. Then for sufficiently small $t > 0$, we have that $tw \in [0, v]$ and

$$\begin{aligned} I_\lambda(tw) &= \int_\Omega P(|\nabla tw|)dx - \lambda \int_\Omega F(x, tw)dx \\ &\le \int_{U_\delta} P(|\nabla tw|)dx - \lambda \int_{U\backslash U_\delta} F(x, tw)dx \\ &\le t^{p^-} \int_{U_\delta} P(|\nabla w|)dx - c\lambda t^{r_0} \int_{U\backslash U_\delta} w^{r_0} dx \le 0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

which shows that the claim is true. By Theorem4.1, therer exists $u_\lambda \in [0, v] \cap C^{1,\alpha}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that $I_\lambda(u_\lambda) = \inf_{[0,v]\cap W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)} I_\lambda$, u_λ is a solution of (P_λ) and a local minimizer of I_λ in the C^1 topology.

When $\lambda \to 0$, we can take $M \to 0$, consequently $|v_M|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0$ and $|u_\lambda|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0$, furthermore, $\|u_\lambda\| \to 0$ and $|u_\lambda|_{C^1(\overline{\Omega})} \to 0$. Assertion (1) is proved.

(2) Obviously $\Lambda_0 \subset \Lambda$. By assertion (1), $\inf \Lambda_0 = \inf \Lambda = 0$. Let $\lambda_1 \in \Lambda$ and $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$

be given arbitrarily. Let u_{λ_1} be a solution of (P_{λ_1}). Then u_{λ_1} is a supersolution of (P_λ). It follows from assertion (1) that there exists a sufficiently small $\lambda_2 < \lambda$ such that (P_{λ_2}) has a solution u_{λ_2} and $u_{\lambda_2} < u_{\lambda_1}$ in Ω. Obviously u_{λ_2} is a subsolution of P_λ. By Theorem4.1, P_λ has a solution u_λ which is a local minimizer of I_λ in the C^1 topology, which shows $\lambda \in \Lambda_0$. Assertion (2) is proved.

(3) Note that, under the additional assumptions, it is easy to verify that $I_\lambda \in C^1(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), R)$ and I_λ satisfies the (PS) condition for all λ(see [11]). Now let$\lambda \in \text{int}\Lambda \subset \Lambda_0$ be given arbitrarily. Take $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \Lambda_0$ with $\lambda_2 < \lambda < \lambda_1$, and let u_{λ_1}, u_λ and u_{λ_2} be a solution of (P_{λ_1}), (P_λ) and (P_{λ_2}) respectively, $u_{\lambda_2} \le u_\lambda \le u_{\lambda_1}$, and let u_λ be a local minimizer of I_λ in the C^1 topology. Then by Theorem4.1, u_λ is also a local minimizer of I_λ in the $W^{1,P}$ topology. Define

$$\widetilde{f_\lambda}(x,t) = \begin{cases} f(x,t), & \text{if } t > u_\lambda(x), \\ f(x, u_\lambda(x)), & \text{if } t \le u_\lambda(x), \end{cases} \tag{4.32}$$

$$\widetilde{g_\lambda}(x,t) = \begin{cases} t^{q-1}, & \text{if } t > u_\lambda(x), \\ (u_\lambda(x))^{q-1}, & \text{if } t \le u_\lambda(x), \end{cases} \tag{4.33}$$

$$\widetilde{F}(x,t) = \int_0^t \widetilde{f_\lambda}(x,s)ds, \quad \widetilde{G}(x,t) = \int_0^t \widetilde{g_\lambda}(x,s)ds. \tag{4.34}$$

Consider problem

$$\begin{cases} -\text{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = \lambda \widetilde{f_\lambda}(x,t) + \mu \widetilde{g_\lambda}(x,t), & \text{in } \Omega \\ u > 0, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.35}$$

and denote the associated functional to (4.35) by $\widetilde{I_\lambda}$. It is easy to see that u_{λ_2} and u_{λ_1} are a subsolution and a supersolution of (4.35) , respectively. By Theorem4.1, there exists $u_\lambda^* \in [u_{\lambda_2}, u_{\lambda_1}] \cap C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ such that u_λ^* is a solution of (4.35) and is a local minimizer of $\widetilde{I_\lambda}$ in the C^1 topology. By Lemma4.1, we can see that $u_\lambda^* \ge u_\lambda$ and consequently u_λ^* is also a solution of (P_λ). If $u_\lambda^* \ne u_\lambda$ then assertion (3) already holds, hence we can assume that $u_\lambda^* = u_\lambda$. Now u_λ is a local minimizer of $\widetilde{I_\lambda}$ in the C^1 topology, and so also in the $W^{1,P}$ topology. We can assume that u_λ is a strictly local minimizer of $\widetilde{I_\lambda}$ in the $W^{1,P}$ topology, otherwise we have obtained assertion (3). It is easy to verify that, under the additional assumptions in statement $\widetilde{I_\lambda} \in C^1(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), R)$ and $\widetilde{I_\lambda}$ satisfies the (PS) condition. From $q > p^+$ and $\mu > 0$, it follows that $\inf\{\widetilde{I_\lambda}(u) : u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\} = -\infty$. Using the mountain pass theorem(see [2]), we know that (4.35) has a solution v_λ such that $v_\lambda \ne u_\lambda$. v_λ as a solution of (4.35), must satisfy $v_\lambda \ge u_\lambda$, and consequently, by Lemma4.2, $v_\lambda > u_\lambda$. Noting that v_λ is also a solution of (P_λ), since $v_\lambda \ge u_\lambda$, thus the proof of assertion (3) is complete.

□

5 Morse theory and multiplicity results

In this section, we use the results of Section 1–4 and Morse theory to obtain existence of multiple solutions. Morse theory is a very useful tool in treating multiple solution problems in the study of nonlinear differential equations. The main concept in this theory is the critical group $C_q(I, u)$ for a C^1-functional $I : X \to R$ at an isolated critical point u, where X is a Banach space. Let $I(u)$ be a C^1–functional defined on a Banach space X, then the k–th critical group of I at an isolated critical point u with $I(u) = c$ is defined by

$$C_q(I, u) := H_q(I^c \cap U, (I^c \cap U)\backslash\{u\}), \quad q \in N = \{0, 1, 2, ...\},$$

where U is any neighborhood of u, H_* is the singular relative homology with coefficients in an Abelian group G and $I^c = I^{-1}(-\infty, c]$.

We say that I satisfies the (C) condition, if any sequence $\{u_n\} \subset X$ such that $\{I(u_n)\}$ is bounded and $(1 + ||u_n||)||I'(u_n)|| \to 0$ has a convergent subsequence; such a sequence is then called a (C) sequence. If I satisfies the (C) condition and the critical values of I are bonded from below by some $\alpha > -\infty$, then the critical groups of at infinity were introduced by Bartsch and Li [8] as

$$C_q(I, \infty) := H_q(X, I^\alpha). \tag{5.1}$$

Note that by the deformation lemma, the right-hand side of (5.1) does not depend on the choice of α.

The reader is referred to [10, 31] for more details on Morse theory. In the proofs of our theorems we shall use the following results.

Proposition 5.1 (Morse inequalities)**.** *Let X be a Banach space. $I \in C^1(X, R)$ satisfies (C) condition. Then*

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} M_q t^q = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} \beta_q t^q + (1 + t)Q(t), \tag{5.2}$$

where $M_q = \sum_{I'(u)=0} \mathrm{rank} C_q(I, u), \beta_q = \mathrm{rank} C_q(I, \infty)$ *and* $Q(t) = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} a_q t^q$ *with* $a_q \in N$.

Here (5.3) means

$$M_q - M_{q-1} + \cdots + (-1)^q M_0 \geq \beta_q - \beta_{q-1} + \cdots + (-1)^q \beta_0,$$

and if $a_q = 0$ for almost all q, then

$$\sum_{q=0}^{\infty} (-1)^q M_q = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} (-1)^q \beta_q. \tag{5.3}$$

In applications, we use critical groups to distinguish critical points, and use Morse inequalities to find unknown critical points.

Proposition 5.2 ([8]). *Assume that $I \in C^1(X, R)$ satisfies (C) condition and I has only finitely many critical points, then*

(1) *If for some $q \in N$ we have $C_q(I, \infty) \neq 0$, then I has a critical point u with $C_q(I, u) \neq 0$.*

(2) *Let $\mathbf{0}$ be an isolated critical point of $I(u)$. If for some $q \in N$ we have $C_q(I, \mathbf{0}) \neq C_q(I, \infty)$, then $I(u)$ has a nonzero critical point.*

Assume that $f(x,t) = g(x,t) - k(x)$ and $f(x,t), g(x,t)$ satisfy the following conditions:

(f_1): $g(x,t) \geq 0$, $g(x,0) = 0$ and $k(x) \in C(\overline{\Omega})$ is positive .

(f_2): $f(x,t)t > 0$ and $f(x,t)$ is superlinear at infinity , that is, the following limit holds uniformly on $x \in \Omega$,

$$\lim_{|t|\to\infty} \frac{f(x,t)}{|t|^{p^+-1}t} = +\infty.$$

(f_3): There exists $\theta \geq 1$ such that for any $s \in [0,1]$ and $p_1, p_2 \in [p^-, p^+]$ there holds

$$\theta \mathcal{F}_{p_1}(x,t) \geq \mathcal{F}_{p_2}(x,st), \quad \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}, \ \forall t \in R,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_p(x,t) = f(x,t)t - pF(x,t)$.

Theorem 5.1. *Assume that the conditions (f_*), (f_1) (f_2) and (f_3) are satisfied. Then problem (P) has at least two nontrivial solutions.*

Proof. Below we will take four steps to prove Theorem5.1.
Step1: The functional satisfies (C) condition.

Let $\{u_n\}$ be a (C) sequence of I. By Lemma2.8, we only need to show that $\{u_n\}$ is bounded.

If $\{u_n\}$ is unbounded, up to a subsequence we may assume that for some $c \in R$,

$$I(u_n) \to c, \quad \|u_n\| \to \infty, \quad \|I'(u_n)\| \|u_n\| \to 0. \tag{5.4}$$

So we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n} f(x,u_n)u_n - F(x,u_n) \right) \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \left\{ I(u_n) - \frac{1}{\overline{p}_n} \langle I'(u_n), u_n \rangle \right\} = c, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\overline{p}_n = \frac{\int_\Omega p(|\nabla u_n|)|\nabla u_n| dx}{\int_\Omega P(|\nabla u_n|) dx}$.

Let $w_n = \frac{u_n}{\|u_n\|}$, up to a subsequence we may assume that

$$w_n \rightharpoonup w \text{ in } W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), \quad w_n \to w \text{ in } L^P(\Omega), \quad w_n \to w \text{ a.e } x \in \Omega. \tag{5.6}$$

If $w = 0$, similar to p–Laplacian case in [23, 35], we can choose a sequence $\{t_n\} \subset R$ such that

$$I(t_n u_n) = \max_{t\in[0,1]} I(tu_n). \tag{5.7}$$

For any $m > \frac{1}{2}$, let $v_n = (2m)^{\frac{1}{p^-}} w_n$. Since $v_n \to 0$ in $L^H(\Omega)$ and

$$F(x,t) \le C(1 + H(t)), \tag{5.8}$$

by the continuity of the operator $F(x,\cdot)$ (see[11]), we see that that $F(\cdot, v_n) \to 0$ in $L^1(\Omega)$. Thus

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega F(x, v_n)dx = 0. \tag{5.9}$$

So for n large enough, $\frac{(2m)^{\frac{1}{p^-}}}{\|u_n\|} \in (0,1)$, and we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} I(t_nu_n) \ge I(v_n) &= \int_\Omega P(|\nabla v_n|) - \int_\Omega F(x,v_n)dx \\ &\ge \int_\Omega P\left((2m)^{\frac{1}{p^-}} \frac{|\nabla u_n|}{\|u_n\|}\right) - \int_\Omega F(x,v_n)dx \\ &\ge 2m - \int_\Omega F(x,v_n)dx \;\; \text{(by Lemma2.4)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

That is $I(t_nu_n) \to \infty$. Now $I(0) = 0$, $I(u_n) \to c$, we see that $t_n \in (0,1)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega p(|\nabla t_nu_n|)|t_n\nabla u_n|dx - \int_\Omega f(x,t_nu_n)t_nu_ndx &= \langle I'(t_nu_n), t_nu_n\rangle \\ &= t_n \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=t_n} I(tu_n) = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

Therefore, by the condition (f_3),

$$\begin{aligned} \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_n} f(x,u_n)u_n - F(x,u_n)\right) &\ge \frac{1}{\theta}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_{tn}} f(x,t_nu_n)t_nu_n - F(x,t_nu_n)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta}\int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\overline{p}_{tn}} \int_\Omega p(|\nabla t_nu_n|)|t_n\nabla u_n|dx - F(x,t_nu_n)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta} I(t_nu_n) \to +\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

where $\overline{p}_{tn} = \frac{\int_\Omega p(|\nabla t_nu_n|)|\nabla t_nu_n|dx}{\int_\Omega P(|\nabla t_nu_n|)dx}$. This contradicts with (5.5).

If $w \neq 0$, from the third limit in (5.4) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) = \langle I'(u_n), u_n\rangle &= \int_\Omega p(|\nabla u_n|)|\nabla u_n|dx - \int_\Omega f(x,u_n)u_ndx \\ &\le p^+ \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u_n|) - \int_\Omega f(x,u_n)u_ndx \\ &\le p^+\|u_n\|^{p^+} - \int_\Omega f(x,u_n)u_ndx. \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

Since $f(x,u)u \ge 0$, we deduce

$$p^+ - o(1) \ge \int_\Omega \frac{f(x,u_n)u_n}{\|u_n\|^{p^+}}dx$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \left(\int_{w=0} + \int_{w\neq 0}\right) \frac{f(x,u_n)u_n}{|u_n|^{p^+}} |w_n|^{p^+} dx \\
&\geq \int_{w\neq 0} \frac{f(x,u_n)u_n}{|u_n|^{p^+}} |w_n|^{p^+} dx. \qquad (5.14)
\end{aligned}
$$

For $x \in \Theta := \{x \in \Omega : w(x) \neq 0\}$, we have $|u_n(x)| \to +\infty$. By the condition (f_2) we have

$$\frac{f(x,u_n)u_n}{|u_n|^{p^+}} |w_n|^{p^+} dx \to +\infty. \qquad (5.15)$$

Note that the Lebesgue measure of Θ is positive, using the Fatou Lemma we deduce

$$\int_{w\neq 0} \frac{f(x,u_n)u_n}{|u_n|^{p^+}} |w_n|^{p^+} dx \to +\infty. \qquad (5.16)$$

This contradicts with (5.14).

Therefore, $\{u_n\}$ is a bounded sequence in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$.

Step2: I is unbounded below.

By the condition (f_2), there exists $C > 0$ such that

$$F(x,t) \geq Ct^{p^+}. \qquad (5.17)$$

So there exists $C_1 > 0$, such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
I(tu) &= \int_\Omega P(|\nabla tu|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x,tu)dx \\
&\leq t^{p^+} \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - Ct^{p^+} \int_\Omega |u|^{p^+} dx + C_1. \qquad (5.18)
\end{aligned}
$$

For some constant C, it is easy to see that

$$\Xi := \{u : P(|\nabla u|) < C \int_\Omega |u|^{p^+} dx\} \neq \emptyset. \qquad (5.19)$$

We can choose $\phi \in \Xi$, and let $t \to +\infty$, we have

$$I(t\phi) \to -\infty. \qquad (5.20)$$

Step3: There exits a pair of strict sub-supersolutions for problem (P).

Problem (P) has a strict supersolution $v = \mathbf{0}$, and a strict subsolution u:

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = -k(x), & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \qquad (5.21)$$

Step4: I has at least two nontrivial critical points.

As in the process of the proof of Theorem4.1, then I has a minimizer u_0 in the $W_0^{1,P}$ toplogy. Since I is unbounded below, there exists $\phi \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ such that $I(\phi) < I(u_0)$. Using mountain pass theorem we know that I has another critical point u_1.

The proof is complete. □

Before the statement of the Theorem5.2 and Theorem5.3, we mention the results about the eigenvalues of the operator $-\Delta_P$(see [19]). In [19], M. García-Huidobro and his coauthers have proved that the principal eigenvalue of the operator $-\Delta_P$ is positive. Similar to p–laplacian case, one can obtain an unbounded sequence of minimax eigenvalues $\{\lambda_{i+1}\}_{i\in N}$ of the operator $-\Delta_P$ by the Lusternik-Schnirlaman theory(see[[5]]) or Yang index theory(see[28]]).

Theorem 5.2. *Assume that the conditions* (f_*), (f_2) , (f_3) *and*

(f_4): $f(x,0) = 0$ *and there exist* $t_0 > 0$ *and* $\lambda \in (0, \lambda_1)$ *such that*

$$F(x,t) < \lambda_1 P(t),\ \text{ for } x \in \Omega, |t| < t_0,$$

are satisfied. Then problem (P) has at least one nontrivial solution.

Proof. In the proof of Theorem5.1, we have proved the functional satisfies (PS) condition. So we can compute $C_q(I,\infty)$.

Let $S = \{u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) : \|u\| = 1\}$. By the condition (f_2) it is easy to see that for any $u \in S$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(tu) &= \int_\Omega P(|\nabla tu|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x,tu)dx \\ &\le t^{p^+}\int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - Ct^{p^+}\int_\Omega |u|^{p^+}dx + C_1 \\ &\le t^{p^+} - Ct^{p^+}\int_\Omega |u|^{p^+}dx + C_1 \ \to -\infty \text{ as } t \to +\infty. \end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

Choose

$$a < \min\left\{\inf_{\|u\|\le 1} I(u), 0\right\}. \tag{5.23}$$

Then for any $u \in S$, there exists $t_0 > 1$ such that $I(t_0 u) \le a$. By (f_3), we have

$$\mathcal{F}_{p^+}(x,z) \ge 0, \quad \text{for } (x,z) \in \Omega \times R. \tag{5.24}$$

Therefore, if

$$I(tu) = \int_\Omega P(|\nabla tu|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x,tu)dx \le a, \tag{5.25}$$

using (5.24) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}I(tu) &= \int_\Omega p(|\nabla tu|)|\nabla u|dx - \int_\Omega u f(x,tu)dx \\ &= \frac{1}{t}\left\{\int_\Omega p(|\nabla tu|)|\nabla tu|dx - \int_\Omega tu f(x,tu)dx\right\} \\ &\le \frac{1}{t}\left\{p^+\int_\Omega P(|\nabla tu|)dx - \int_\Omega tu f(x,tu)dx\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq \frac{1}{t}\left\{p^+a + \int_\Omega p^+F(x,tu)dx - \int_\Omega tuf(x,tu)dx\right\}\\&\leq \frac{1}{t}\left\{p^+a - \int_\Omega \mathcal{F}_{p^+}(x,tu)dx\right\}\\&\leq \frac{1}{t}p^+a < 0.\end{aligned}\tag{5.26}$$

Therefore, by the Implicit Function Theorem, there exists a unique $T \in C(S,R)$ such that $I(T(u)u) = a$.

Using the function T , we can follow the argument in [34] to construct a strong deformation retract from $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ to I^a, and deduce

$$C_q(I,\infty) = H_q(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), I^a) \cong H_q(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}) \cong 0.$$

By the the condition (f_4), the function $\mathbf{0}$ is a local minimizer of I. Hence, $C_q(I,u_0) = \delta_{q,0}Z$. Then using Proposition5.2 problem (P) has at least one nontrivial solutions in $W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$. □

In Theorem5.1 andTheorem5.2, the conditions (f_2) and (f_3) mean that the nonlinearity is superlinear at infinity. It is natural to consider the dual case. In our last result we consider the case that the nonlinearity is sublinear at infinity and superlinear at zero. We assume the following conditions on $f(x,t)$.

(f_1'): $f(x,0) \equiv 0$.

(f_2'): $f(x,t)$ is superlinear at zero, that is, the following limit holds uniformly on $x \in \overline{\Omega}$,

$$\lim_{|t|\to 0} \frac{f(x,t)}{|t|^{p^+-2}t} = +\infty.$$

(f_3'): $p^-F(x,t) - f(x,t)t > 0,\ \forall x \in \overline{\Omega}$ and $t \neq 0$.

(f_4'): $\displaystyle\lim_{|t|\to+\infty} \frac{f(x,t)}{p(t)} < \lambda_1$ unifomly in $x \in \overline{\Omega}$.

Theorem 5.3. *Assume that the conditions (f_*'), (f_1') (f_2') (f_3') and (f_4') are satisfied. Then problem (P) has at least three nontrivial solutions.*

Proof. Below we will take three steps to prove Theorem5.3.

Step1: The functional satisfies (PS) condition.

By the condition (f_4'), we easily know that the functional I is coercive. Hence I satisfies (PS) condition.

Step2: $C_q(I,0) = 0$.

For $u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$, we have

$$\lim_{|s|\to 0} \frac{I(su)}{|s|^{p^-}} = -\infty. \tag{5.27}$$

In fact, for any $\{s_n\} \subset R$ with $s_n \to 0$, let $v_n = s_n u$. Then

$$v_n \to 0 \text{ in } W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), \quad v_n \to 0 \text{ a.e. } x \in \Omega. \tag{5.28}$$

By the condition (f_2') and Fatou Lemmawe have

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_\Omega \frac{F(x,v_n)}{|v_n|^{p^-}} |u|^{p^-} dx \geq \int_\Omega \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{F(x,v_n)}{|v_n|^{p^-}} |u|^{p^-} dx = +\infty. \tag{5.29}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I(s_n u)}{|s_n|^{p^-}} &= \frac{\int_\Omega P(|\nabla s_n u|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x, s_n u)dx}{|s_n|^{p^-}} \\ &\leq \frac{|s_n|^{p^-} \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x, s_n u)dx}{|s_n|^{p^-}} \\ &\leq \int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx - \int_\Omega \frac{F(x,v_n)}{|v_n|^{p^-}} |u|^{p^-} dx \to -\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

and (5.29) follows.

Using (5.29), we see that for any $u \in W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$, there exists $s_0 \in (0,1)$ such that

$$I(su) < 0, \quad \text{for } s \in (0, s_0). \tag{5.31}$$

Assume that $I(u) \geq 0$, that is

$$\int_\Omega P(|\nabla u|)dx \geq \int_\Omega F(x,u)dx. \tag{5.32}$$

Then according (f_3'), for $u \in I^{-1}[0,+\infty)\backslash\{0\}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=1} I(su) &= \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=1} \left(\int_\Omega P(|\nabla su|)dx - \int_\Omega F(x,su)dx \right) \\ &= \int_\Omega p(|\nabla u|)|\nabla u| dx - \int_\Omega u f(x,u)dx \\ &\geq \int_\Omega p^- P(|\nabla u|)dx - \int_\Omega u f(x,u)dx \\ &\geq \int_\Omega (p^- F(x,u) - u f(x,u))dx > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

Now we adjust the argument in the proof of [21, Theorem 2.1] or [24, Proposition 2.1] slightly. From (5.31) and (5.33), we see that for any $u \in I^{-1}[0,+\infty)\backslash\{0\}$, there exists a unique $T = T(u) > 0$ such that $I(Tu) = 0$. Moreover, since $I(Tu) = 0$, from (5.33) we deduce

$$\frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=T} I(tu) = \frac{1}{T} \frac{d}{ds}\Big|_{s=1} I(sTu) > 0. \tag{5.34}$$

Thus, by the Implicit Function Theorem we see that T is continuous on $I^{-1}[0,+\infty)\backslash\{0\}$. If $I(u) \leq 0$, we set $T(u) = 1$. Then $T : W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \to R$ is continuous.

We now define $\eta : [0,1] \times W_0^{1,P}(\Omega) \to W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)$ by

$$\eta(s,u) = (1-s)u + sT(u)u, \quad (s,u) \in [0,1] \times W_0^{1,P}(\Omega). \tag{5.35}$$

It is easy to see that η is a continuous deformation from $(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\backslash\{0\})$ to $(I^0, I^0\backslash\{0\})$, hence

$$C_k(I,0) = H_k(I^0, I^0\backslash\{0\}) \cong H_k(W_0^{1,P}(\Omega), W_0^{1,P}(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}) = 0, \quad k \in N. \tag{5.36}$$

Step3: I has at least three nontrivial critical points.

By the condition (f_4'), there exist constants $c \in (0, \lambda_1)$ and $d > 0$ such that

$$f(x,s) \le ca(|s|)s + d \quad \text{unifomly in } x \in \Omega \text{ and } s > 0, \tag{5.37}$$

and

$$f(x,s) \ge -ca(|s|)s - d \quad \text{unifomly in } x \in \Omega \text{ and } s < 0. \tag{5.38}$$

We consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} -\mathrm{div}(a(|\nabla u|)\nabla u) = ca(|u|)u + d, & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{5.39}$$

Similar to p–laplacian case, by Riesz representation theorem, the above problem has positive solution v. Lemma4.2 implies that $v > 0$ on Ω and hence v is a supersolution of problem (P). Obviously the function $\mathbf{0}$ is a subsolution of problem (P). As in the proof of Theorem4.1, then I has a local minimizer $u^+ > 0$ in the $W_0^{1,P}$ toplogy and $I(u^+) < 0$.

Similarly, we can obtain another local minimizer $u^- < 0$ in the $W_0^{1,P}$ toplogy and $I(u^-) < 0$.

Hence the critical groups of I at its local minimizer are

$$C_q(I,u^+) = C_q(I,u^-) = \delta_{q0}Z, \quad \forall q \in N. \tag{5.40}$$

Now if we choose a, b satisfying

$$a < \inf I(u) \le \min\{I(u^+), I(u^-)\} \le \max\{I(u^+), I(u^-)\} \le b. \tag{5.41}$$

Assume that I has only two critical points, that is, $K_a^b = \{u^+, u^-\}$. Then we have

$$C_q(I,\infty) = H_q(I^b, I^a) \cong \delta_{q0}Z \oplus Z, \quad \forall q \in N, \tag{5.42}$$

and

$$H_q(I^b, I^a) \cong H_q(I^b, \emptyset) \cong H_q(I^b), \quad \forall q \in N. \tag{5.43}$$

On the other hand, since I is bounded below and satisfies the (PS) condition, we have

$C_q(I,\infty) = H_q(W_0^{1,P}) = \delta_{q0}Z$. Therefore it follows immediately from the Morse inequalities and (5.40) that there must be one more critical point $u \neq 0$.

The proof is completed. □

References

[1] R. Adams, J. F. Fournier, Sobolev Spaces(Second Edition), Acad. Press(2003).

[2] A. Ambrosetti, P.H. Rabinowitz, Dual variational methods in critical point theory and applications, J. Funct. Anal. 14 (1973) 349–381.

[3] A. Ambrosetti, G.J. Azorero, I. Peral, Multiplicity for some nonlinear elliptic equations, J. Funct. Anal. 137 (1996) 219–242.

[4] H. Amann, Fixed point equations and nonlinear eigenvalue problems in ordered Banach spaces, SIAM Rev. 18 (1976) 620–709.

[5] H. Amann, Liusternik-Schnirelman theory and non-linear eigenvalue problems, Math. Ann. 199 (1972) 55–72 .

[6] J.G. Azorero, I.P. Alonso, Existence and nonuniqueness for the p-Laplacian nonlinear eigenvalues, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 12 (1987) 1389–403.

[7] J.G. Azorero, J.J. Manfredi, I.P. Alonso, Sobolev versus Höder local minimizer and global multiplicity for some quasilinear elliptic equations, Commun. Contemp. Math. 2 (2000) 385404.

[8] T. Bartsch, S. J. Li, Critical point theory for asymptotically quadratic functionals and applications to problems with resonance, Nonl. Anal. 28(1997)419–441.

[9] H. Brezis, L. Nirenberg, H^1 versus C^1 local minimizers, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 317 (1993) 465–472.

[10] K. C. Chang, Infnite Dimensional Morse Theory and Multiple Solution Problem. Birkhäuser, Boston(1993).

[11] Ph. Clément, M. García-Huidobro, R. Manásevich, K. Schmitt, Moutain pass type solutions for quasilinear elliptic equations, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 11(2000)33–62.

[12] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi, Regularity, monotonicity and symmetry of positive solutions of m–Laplace equations, J. Differential Equations 206 (2004) 483–515

[13] L. Damascelli, B. Sciunzi, Harnack inequalities, maximum and comparison principles, and regularity of positive solutions of m-Laplace equations, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations 25 (2005) 139–159.

[14] M. Degiovanni, S. Lancelotti, Linking over cones and nontrivial solutions for p–Laplace equations with p-superlinear nonlinearity, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré: Analyse Non Linéaire 24 (2007) 907–919.

[15] P. Drábek, J. Hernández, Existence and uniqueness of positive solutions for some quasilinear elliptic problems, Nonlinear Anal. 44 (2001) 189–204.

[16] N. Fukagai, M. Ito, M, K. Narukawa, Positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic equations with critical Orlicz–Sobolev nonlinearity on R^N, Funkcialaj Ekvacioj 49(2006) 235-267.

[17] N. Fukagai, K. Narukawa, On the existence of Multiple positive solutions of quasilinear elliptic eigenvalue problems, Annadli di Matematica 186(3) (2007) 539–564.

[18] N. Fusco, C. Sbordone, Some remarks on the regularity of minima of anisotropic integrals, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 18 (1993) 153–167.

[19] M. García-Huidobro, V. Le, R. Manásevich, K. Schmitt, On principal eigenvalues for quasilinear elliptic differential operators: An Orlicz-Sobolev space setting, Nonlinear Diff. Eqns. Appl. 6(1999) 207–225.

[20] M. Guedda, L. Véron, Quasilinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents. Nonlinear Anal. 13(1989)879–902

[21] Y.X. Guo, J.Q. Liu, Solutions of p–sublinear p–Laplacian equation via Morse theory, J. London Math. Soc. 72 (2005) 632–644.

[22] Z.M. Guo, Z.T. Zhang, $W^{1,p}$ versus C^1 local minimizers and multiplicity results for quasilinear elliptic equations, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 286 (2003) 32–50.

[23] L. Jeanjean, On the existence of bounded PalaisCSmale sequences and application to a Landesman–Lazer type problem set on R^N , Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh 129 (1999) 787–809.

[24] Q. S. Jiu, J. B. Su, Existence and multiplicity results for Dirichlet problems with p-Laplacian, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 281(2003) 587–601.

[25] O.A. Ladyzenskaja, N.N. Ural'tzeva, Linear and Quasilinear Elliptic Equations, Academic Press, New York, 1968.

[26] S.J. Li, Z.Q.Wang, Mountain pass theorem in order intervals and multiple solutions for semilinear elliptic Dirichlet problems, J. Anal. Math. 81 (2000) 373–396.

[27] S. B. Liu, Existence of solutions to a superlinear p–Laplacian equation, Electron. J. Differential Eq. 66 (2001) 1–6.

[28] K. Perera, Nontrivial critical groups in *p*–Laplacian problem via the Yang index, Topol. Methods Nonlinear Anal. 21(2003) 301–309.

[29] G. M. Lieberman, Boundary regularity for solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, Nonlinear Anal. 12 (1988)1203–1219.

[30] G. M. Lieberman, The natural generalization of the natural conditions of Ladyzhenskaya and Ural'tseva for elliptic equations, Comm. Partial Differential Equations 16 (1991) 311–361.

[31] J. Mawhin, M. Willem, Critical Point Theory and Hamiltonian Systems, Springer, Berlin(1989).

[32] P. Pucci , J. Serrin, The strong maximum principle revisited, J. Differential Equations 196 (2004) 1–66.

[33] M. M. Rao, Z. D. Ren, Theory of Orlicz Spaces, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1985.

[34] Z. Q. Wang, On a superlinear elliptic equation, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 8(1991) 43–57.

[35] W.M. Zou, Variant fountain theorems and their applications, Manuscripta Math. 104 (2001) 343–358.